Interview Summary	Application N	10.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,611		LEYLAND-JONES, BRIAN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jacob Cheu		1641	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) Jacob Cheu.	(3) <u>Long Le (SPE)</u> .			
(2) <u>Ms. Saunders</u> .	(4) <u>Dr. Ajami</u> .			
Date of Interview: <u>11 May 2005</u> .				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>29,51,58 and 59</u> .				
Identification of prior art discussed: Desta et al. Clinicla Pharma & Therapeu. 65: 10.				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
		,		
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's sign	ature, if required	

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 10/072,611

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant distinguished the invention from Desta reference, in particular, with the feature of "quantifying a ratio of respective detected metabolites of each probe." Applicant is advised to clarify claim language, for instance, the relation of the "drug" with respect to the substrates. Also, applicant is advised to show the support for the relation of quantifying a ratio of the respective metabolites with the individualizing a selected safe and therapeutical effective drug treatment.